

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 324

CS 501 355

AUTHOR Reinsch, N. L., Jr.
TITLE Metaphor Content and Perceived Credibility: A Regression Analysis.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (61st, Houston, Texas, December 1975)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Skills; *Credibility; *Figurative Language; Language Research; *Language Role; *Metaphors; Personality; Rating Scales; Sex Differences

ABSTRACT

This study explored the relationship of metaphor content and the perceived credibility of the person using the metaphor. The subjects were 190 persons attending Western Illinois University who were exposed to two credibility inductions, each including a figurative statement, and then were asked to rate the credibility of each source. The figurative expression took eight different forms as follows, with alternatives in parentheses: I (like) (dislike) W.I.U.; W.I.U. is like (a thunderstorm) (Mayor Richard Daley) (a monastery) (a science fiction novel). Two fictitious sources for the figurative expressions were developed, one male and one female. Semantic differential scales and credibility scales were composed and used as pretests and posttests and then analyzed by a stepwise linear regression formula. The results provided support for the hypothesis that metaphor content can partially account for perceived source credibility. For both sources the dimensions of sociability and composure were the dimensions on which the largest percentage of variance was explained. It was also noted that male competence appears to be significantly more sensitive than female competence to metaphor content. (NKM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED122324

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Metaphor Content and Perceived Credibility:

A Regression Analysis*

by

N. L. Reinsch, Jr.

Assistant Professor

Communication Arts and Sciences

Western Illinois University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. L. Reinsch, Jr.

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

A Paper Presented at
the 61st Annual Meeting
Speech Communication Association
Houston, Texas
December, 1975

*This research was supported by a grant from the
Western Illinois University Faculty Research Council.

CS561 355

Metaphor Content and Perceived Credibility:

A Regression Analysis

Students of public communication have long assumed that, in addition to enhancing effectiveness, figurative language should improve a source's image. Cicero (De Oratore, 3. 39, 160), for example, suggested that use of metaphor might be taken as a "mark of cleverness."

The most complete--though limited--modern discussion of figurative language and source credibility is provided by Osborn (1963). At least three possible mechanisms are discernible: admiration, gratitude, and identification. First, it is suggested (p. 212) that a "major source of ethical proof" is the recognition by the audience that in constructing a metaphor the source has "endured through frustration and search to a valuable discovery." This sort of admiration seems closely related to Cicero's remark about "cleverness." Second, it is argued (p. 304) that an interpreter "must feel some debt of obligation or sense of gratitude towards the speaker" who through a trope has been able to "alleviate that tedium we find in a fixed sensory world." And third, use of archetypal metaphor may promote identification through the shared experiences evoked (p. 322).

The possibilities suggested by Osborn have remained largely undeveloped. While several investigations of

figurative language have included credibility as a dependent variable, the main focus of these studies has been persuasion with credibility appended almost as an afterthought. There is neither a comprehensive model of the relationship nor the sort of systematic data which would facilitate model construction. Several of the most basic assumptions have little or no empirical support. This investigation was an exploratory study intended as a preliminary step toward model construction.

Research questions were developed in three areas: can metaphor content account for perceived credibility; if so, for which dimension can it account; and which aspects of metaphor content account for credibility? These questions are discussed below.

First, can metaphor content account for perceived credibility? Of the three mechanisms posited by Osborn only the third (identification) involves any necessary attention to content. The other two, along with Cicero, imply that the mere presence of effective figurative language can enhance credibility. Instead of consistent positive effects, however, Bowers and Osborn (1966) observed both increased and decreased credibility as a result of metaphoric language. In offering possible explanations for these results (p. 154) they appealed to metaphor content. While the assumption that content is important has been adopted by subsequent researchers

(Reinsch, 1974), there has been no direct attempt to measure the presumed explanatory powers of content.

Second, which aspects of credibility are most affected by metaphor content? Contemporary students of communication seem unanimous in viewing credibility as multi-dimensional but no attempt has been made to suggest which dimensions are sensitive to the use of rhetorical tropes. Intuitively it seems that dynamism and related dimensions should be most affected. Bowers and Osborn (1966) observed effects on dimensions of competence, trustworthiness and ingenuity--there is, however, some question concerning the validity of the ingenuity factor (Bowers and Phillips, 1967). Reinsch (1974) reported significant effects on authoritativeness but not on character or dynamism.

Third, which aspects of metaphor content can account for perceived credibility? This question can be viewed from at least two perspectives: chronologic and linguistic. Contemporary models of metaphor (Osborn and Ehninger, 1962; Jordan, 1972) argue for a chronological three-stage reaction to metaphorical stimuli. From these models it is possible to identify three aspects of metaphor content: materials, process and product. Materials refers to the metaphoric tenor and vehicle perceived by the receiver as separate concepts prior to reception of the trope. Process designates the receiver's mental accommodation and

assimilation of the figurative stimulus including changes in perception of the tenor and vehicle. Product refers to the end result, the achieved metaphoric meaning. Obviously any attempt to make firm distinctions between such closely related aspects of metaphor response is somewhat arbitrary. But prior research has sometimes focused on materials to the exclusion of process or product (Reinsch, 1972, p. 23).

The other perspective from which this question may be viewed is concerned with the relative contributions of the two linguistic constituents, tenor and vehicle. Contemporary views of metaphor insist that metaphoric meaning is a product of both constituents. But Frentz (1974) reported results in which metaphoric meaning was largely accounted for by the metaphoric vehicles (77 and 86 percent of the variance) in contrast to tenors (9 and 6 percent).

Methods and Procedures

In this investigation Subjects were exposed to two credibility inductions, each of which included a figurative statement, and then asked to rate the credibility of each source. A variety of other ratings believed to represent aspects of metaphor content were also collected or derived. Data were analyzed with stepwise linear regression to see if and how metaphor content might account for perceived credibility.

The metaphoric tenor was Western Illinois University (W.I.U.) Four different metaphoric vehicles were used:

a thunderstorm, Mayor Richard Daley, a monastery, and a science fiction novel. The vehicles were selected to represent a wide range of concepts. In addition, each vehicle was used to express either a positive (like) or a negative (dislike) attitude toward the tenor. The figurative expression took, then, eight different forms as follows (with alternatives in parentheses): I (like)(dislike) W.I.U.; W.I.U. is like (a thunderstorm)(Mayor Richard Daley)(a monastery)(a science fiction novel).

Two fictitious sources, one male and one female, were developed. The sources were described as students in a creative writing class who had been required to construct a trope expressing their attitudes and revealing something of themselves. They were described as "very satisfied" with their efforts. Other information about the sources was minimized. These procedures were designed to make the figurative language a significant source of information about the source. The materials are included in Appendix A.

Semantic differential scales were selected to represent Activity, Evaluation, and Potency (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1967). Credibility scales were selected to represent Homophily (McCroskey and Hamilton, 1973), Sociability, Composure, Competence, Extraversion and Character (McCroskey, 1972). The use of Homophily scales was suggested by Osborn's discussion of identification.

A list of all scales is included in Appendix B.

Each experimental subject filled out a pretest for the tenor and vehicles. Then he or she was exposed to a credibility induction (including a version of the figurative language), posttests of the tenor and vehicle (how the subject thought the source would rate the concepts), and posttests of perceived credibility. Then a second credibility induction and set of posttests were presented. The order of the two sources and the version of figurative language were systematically varied.

Subjects were collected on the campus of Western Illinois University during the Summer and Fall quarters of 1975. Useable responses were collected from 190 persons most of whom were enrolled in the required basic public speaking course; a few (approximately 40) were enrolled in a course required of Mass Communication majors.

From the data collected six criterion variables and thirty-six predictor variables were identified. The criterion variables were scores for the six dimensions of credibility. Predictor variables included Activity, Evaluation and Potency ratings of tenor and vehicles both before and after the credibility inductions plus several derived scores. A complete list of variables is provided in Figure 1. Pretest scores for the tenor (variables 13, 14, 15) and vehicle (16, 17, 18) and measures of the pretest discrepancy between tenor and vehicle (22, 23, 24) were taken as measures of the metaphoric materials.

Figure 1
Criterion and Predictor Variables

1	Homophily
2	Sociability
3	Composure
4	Competence
5	Extraversion
6	Character
7	Activity of Product Tenor
8	Evaluation of Product Tenor
9	Potency of Product Tenor
10	Activity of Product Vehicle
11	Evaluation of Product Vehicle
12	Potency of Product Vehicle
13	Activity of Materials Tenor
14	Evaluation of Materials Tenor
15	Potency of Materials Tenor
16	Activity of Materials Vehicle
17	Evaluation of Materials Vehicle
18	Potency of Materials Vehicle
19	Product Activity Tension (7 - 10)
20	Product Evaluation Tension (8 - 11)
21	Product Potency Tension (9 - 12)
22	Materials Activity Tension (13 - 16)
23	Materials Evaluation Tension (14 - 17)
24	Materials Potency Tension (15 - 18)
25	Tenor Activity Shift (7 - 13)
26	Tenor Evaluation Shift (8 - 14)
27	Tenor Potency Shift (9 - 15)
28	Vehicle Activity Shift (10 - 16)
29	Vehicle Evaluation Shift (11 - 17)
30	Vehicle Potency Shift (12 - 18)
31	Activity Tension Reduction (22 - 19)
32	Evaluation Tension Reduction (23 - 20)
33	Potency Tension Reduction (24 - 21)
34	Total Activity Change (25 + 28)
35	Total Evaluation Change (26 + 29)
36	Total Potency Change (27 + 30)

Posttest scores for the tenor (7, 8, 9) and vehicle (10, 11, 12) plus posttest discrepancy (19, 20, 21) were taken as measures of the product. The metaphoric process was measured by shifts in the tenor (25, 26, 27) and vehicle (28, 29, 30), the sum (absolute values) of change for tenor and vehicle (34, 35, 36) and the net reduction of tenor-vehicle discrepancy between pretest and posttest (31, 32, 33). The content of the metaphoric tenor was measured with pretests (13, 14, 15), change scores (25, 26, 27) and posttests (7, 8, 9); the vehicle was measured in an analogous manner (16, 17, 18, 20, 29, 30, 10, 11, 12).

Results and Discussion

Scores were analyzed with multiple stepwise linear regression using the BMD02R program (Dixon, 1973). Significance was set at the .05 level. The regression analysis was terminated if an entering variable produced a nonsignificant regression model or if an additional predictor variable did not account for at least an additional 1 percent of the variance. The male and female sources were analyzed separately.

The first research question was whether or not metaphor content permitted significant explanations of perceived credibility. The assumption that metaphor content affects credibility suggests that significant regression models should be possible. As can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2 a significant regression model was observed for

Table 1
Regression Analysis: Male Source

Cri- terion	Pre- dictors	R	R ²	Beta	F
Homophily				6.732	15.642
	8	0.3768	0.1420	0.291	3/186
	35	0.4273	0.1825	0.227	
	16	0.4488	0.2015	-0.254	
Sociability				4.978	183.791
	8	0.7031	0.4943	0.639	1/188
Composure				8.114	15.169
	8	0.4240	0.1798	0.330	4/185
	12	0.4642	0.2154	-0.151	
	35	0.4790	0.2294	-0.115	
	25	0.4970	0.2470	-0.102	
Competence				7.571	9.471
	11	0.3628	0.1316	0.121	5/184
	13	0.3968	0.1575	0.129	
	35	0.4242	0.1799	0.160	
	10	0.4378	0.1916	-0.124	
	18	0.4524	0.2047	-0.081	
Extraversion				11.539	6.407
	28	0.2497	0.0623	0.218	3/186
	24	0.2829	0.0801	-0.172	
	21	0.3060	0.0937	0.287	
Character				7.489	8.639
	8	0.3487	0.1216	0.161	5/184
	31	0.3833	0.1469	0.114	
	17	0.4047	0.1638	0.136	
	35	0.4204	0.1768	-0.118	
	13	0.4360	0.1901	-0.089	

Table 2
Regression Analysis: Female Source

Cri- terion	Pre- dictors	R	R ²	Beta	r
Homophily				11.006	9.972
	11	0.3354	0.1125	0.393	5/184
	34	0.3960	0.1568	-0.327	
	13	0.4205	0.1768	-0.331	
	33	0.4506	0.2031	-0.332	
	36	0.4617	0.2132	0.194	
Sociability				5.839	32.036
	8	0.6223	0.3873	0.334	5/184
	25	0.6486	0.4207	0.270	
	11	0.6638	0.4406	0.163	
	34	0.6731	0.4531	-0.155	
	35	0.6822	0.4654	0.121	
Composite				10.188	11.208
	8	0.3901	0.1522	0.304	5/184
	34	0.4263	0.1877	-0.172	
	9	0.4565	0.2084	-0.169	
	13	0.4689	0.2139	0.122	
	24	0.4832	0.2335	-0.154	
Competence				10.049	6.905
	29	0.1882	0.0354	0.106	1/188
Extraversion				7.937	3.795
	10	0.1944	0.0378	0.163	7/182
	17	0.2520	0.0635	0.160	
	25	0.2794	0.0781	0.135	
	36	0.3058	0.0935	-0.197	
	16	0.3240	0.1050	-0.194	
	9	0.3398	0.1155	-0.123	
	20	0.3569	0.1274	0.158	
Character				9.628	23.129
	8	0.3310	0.1095	0.222	1/188

each source on each dimension of credibility. These results provide support for the assumption that metaphor content can partially account for perceived source credibility. These findings do not preclude metaphor presence as a contributor to perceived credibility but they do indicate that content--rather than or in addition to mere presence--can explain a significant part of the variance.

The second research question asked which dimensions of credibility were sensitive to metaphor content. Six dimensions of credibility were used as criterion variables in this study. Competence (4) is equivalent to the previously tested dimensions of Authoritativeness and Competence; and Character, to Trustworthiness and Character. Extraversion (6) is the dimension most closely approximating the previously tested Dynamism. Homophily (1), Sociability (2) and Composure (3) have not been tested previously. As shown in Table 1 and Table 2 there was considerable variation among criterion variables in the percentage of variance accounted for. The dimensions of Sociability and Composure were for both sources the dimensions on which the largest percentage of variance was explained. A one-variable model explained 49 percent of the variance on male Sociability and a five-variable model explained 47 percent on female Sociability; in each case the best single predictor was variable #8 Evaluation of Product Tenor. A five-variable model accounted for 23 per-

cent of the variance on female Composure and a four-variable model accounted for 25 percent on male Composure; Evaluation of Product Tenor was again the best single predictor in each case. A three-variable model accounted for 20 percent of the variance on male Homophily and a five-variable model accounted for 21 percent on female Homophily; Evaluation of the Product Tenor was the best single predictor on male Homophily and Evaluation of Product Vehicle (# 11) was the best single predictor on Female Homophily. On male Competence a five-variable model accounted for 20 percent of the variance with Evaluation of Product Vehicle the best single predictor. A five-variable model explained 19 percent of the variance on male Character; the best single predictor was Evaluation of Product Tenor. Differences between R values were examined with z-tests (McNemar, 1969, pp. 157-158). Results indicate that for both sources the Sociability R was significantly higher than for any other credibility dimension. For the male source the R for Composure was significantly higher than that for Extraversion. For the female source the R values for both Composure and Homophily were significantly higher than for Competence. The only differences between the sources was that the R for male Competence was significantly higher than for female Competence.

These results show that credibility dimensions differ

significantly in the degree to which they can be accounted for by metaphor content. Specifically, these results suggest that Sociability is the dimension most sensitive to the content of figurative language. Composure and Homophily are also relatively sensitive. The fact that these dimensions have not been tested previously may partially explain the difficulty of demonstrating significant effects. It is also interesting that male Competence appears to be significantly more sensitive than female Competence to metaphor content.

A third research question asked which aspects of metaphor content could account for perceived credibility. One approach to this question operationally distinguished between Materials, Process, and Product (see pp. 3-4). Table 3 records the variance accounted for under the different conditions. The most interesting and obvious pattern is the relative inferiority of Materials. Tests (z-tests of Rs) revealed no significant differences between the Process and Product models. Models based on Materials, however, had significantly smaller Rs than either Process or Product for both male and female Sociability and Composure. In addition significant models based on Materials were not possible for male Extraversion and for female Competence and Character. On female Homophily the Materials model was significantly less effective than the Process model. These results indicate that the Materials

aspect of metaphoric content does not provide the most powerful explanation of perceived credibility. Either Process or Product variables provide a significant improvement over Materials variables on most dimensions of credibility. What a source does with his materials may be more important than the metaphoric materials themselves.

Table 3
Variance Accounted for by Measures of
Materials, Process and Product

Credibility Dimension	Materials	Process	Product
Male Source			
Homophily	0.0592	0.1647	0.1420
Sociability	0.0493	0.4461	0.4943
Composure	0.0208	0.2369	0.2154
Competence	0.0911	0.1250	0.1521
Extraversion	*	0.0939	0.0277
Character	0.0528	0.1394	0.1216
Female Source			
Homophily	0.0301	0.2013	0.1125
Sociability	0.0342	0.4089	0.4275
Composure	0.0419	0.2088	0.1702
Competence	*	0.0354	0.0293
Extraversion	0.0657	0.0732	0.0378
Character	*	0.0830	0.1095

*Nonsignificant regression model.

A second analysis of the contribution of various parts of metaphor content distinguished between tenor and vehicle. As can be seen in Table 4 significant regression models for each dimension were generated from each set of variables. Tests revealed no significant differences between tenor based models and vehicle based models. In this investigation there was no evidence of vehicle dominance such as observed by Frentz (1974). These results are consistent with the view that the metaphor experience is an interaction involving both linguistic constituents.

Table 4
Variance Accounted for by Measures of
Tenor and Vehicle

Credibility Dimension	Male Source		Female Source	
	Tenor	Vehicle	Tenor	Vehicle
Homophily	0.1586	0.1376	0.1316	0.1125
Sociability	0.4943	0.4499	0.4207	0.3951
Composure	0.2226	0.2055	0.1702	0.1281
Competence	0.1667	0.1711	0.0197	0.0354
Extraversion	0.0403	0.0785	0.0295	0.0764
Character	0.1375	0.1200	0.1095	0.0922

This investigation provides, then, data relevant to several basic issues concerning figurative language and source credibility. It demonstrates that indices of metaphor content can account for statistically significant per-

centages of variance on perceived credibility. It suggests that certain dimensions of credibility are more sensitive than others to metaphor content. It indicates that on those dimensions of credibility most sensitive to metaphor content indices of metaphoric Process or Product provide regression models significantly more effective than metaphoric Materials. Finally, no statistically significant differences were found between tenor based and vehicle based regression models. Before the implications of these results are discussed, however, three limitations should be noted. First, the experimental procedures were designed to enhance the impact of the tropes on perceived credibility and may, thereby, have distorted the impact. It would be useful to attempt to replicate these findings with tropes presented in a speech context. Second, only one metaphoric tenor was used and subjects may have been egoinvolved with that tenor. This may have distorted the impact of the metaphoric tenor. Third, it should be remembered that a regression analysis assumes causality but does not prove it.

Even with these qualifications, however, the findings appear to have several important implications for future research and theorizing. The finding that metaphor content can account for significant percentages of variance on perceived credibility was not unexpected. It does support the present emphasis on metaphor content and suggests that models of this relationship must reinterpret or replace

assumptions concerning "cleverness" or "gratitude" with others including metaphor content as an integral part. The relative inferiority of Materials based regression models (in comparison to Process or Product based models) should caution us against the assumption that "content" means only metaphoric materials prior to the metaphoric linkage. (For an example see Reinsch, 1972, p. 23.) Our research and theorizing should include the entire metaphoric process as a credibility affecting stimulus.

The lack of significant differences between the explanatory powers of tenor and vehicle is consistent with the view that the metaphor experience is an interaction of both elements. As such it supports contemporary models of metaphor. While this effect could be due to the nature of the experimental tenor in this investigation it does suggest the desirability of continued study of the tenor as an influence on perceived credibility. The different pattern of results observed by Frentz (1974) may reflect the differences in criterion variables, differences in metaphoric stimuli or some experimental artifact.

The differing sensitivity of the various dimensions of credibility is potentially a most significant finding. In this investigation two frequently tested dimensions, Competence and Character, proved less sensitive to metaphor content than some other dimensions. Extraversion, which bears some similarity to the previously tested Dynamism

(both use the timid--bold scale), was also relatively insensitive. The most sensitive dimension, Sociability, seemed to be concerned with the interpersonal pleasantness of the source (see Appendix B). This concept does not seem directly related to admiration, gratitude, or identification as previously conceived. Instead it may reflect whether or not the metaphor experience was pleasant and agreeable for the receiver. Perhaps we primarily view the maker of appropriate metaphors as a source of personal mental pleasure. If so, a refinement of the gratitude mechanism so that pleasure comes from content in addition to or in place of novelty may provide an initial theoretical position.

The effects of figurative language on perceived source credibility remains an intriguing, if minor, puzzle. Hopefully, this study suggests where we might look for some of the missing pieces.

References

- Cicero. De oratore. (trans. E. W. Sutton & H. Rackham) Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959
- Bowers, J. W. & Osborn, M. M. Attitudinal effects of selected types of concluding metaphors in persuasive discourse. Speech Monographs, 1966, 33, 147-155.
- Bowers, J. W. & Phillips, W. A. A note on the generality of source-credibility scales. Speech Monographs, 1967, 34, 185-186.

- Dixon, W. J. (Ed.) Bmd: Biomedical computer programs. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1973.
- Frentz, T. S. Toward a resolution of the generative semantics/classical theory controversy: A psycholinguistic analysis of metaphor. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1974, 60, 125-133.
- Jordan, W. J. A reinforcement model of metaphor. Speech Monographs, 1972, 39, 223-226.
- McCroskey, J. C. Scales for the measurement of peer credibility. Unpublished monograph, Communication Research Center, Illinois State University, 1972.
- McCroskey, J. C. & Hamilton, P. R. Measurement of Homophily. Unpublished monograph, West Virginia University, 1973. (Wheeless, L. R. Relationships of four elements to immediate recall and student-instructor interaction. Western Speech Communication, 1975, 39, p. 135.)
- McNemar, Q. Psychological statistics. (4th ed.) New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1969.
- Osborn, M. M. The function and significance of metaphor in rhetorical discourse. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1963.
- Osborn, M. M. & Ehninger, D. The metaphor in public address. Speech Monographs, 1962, 29, 223-234.
- Osgood, C. E.; Suci, G. J. & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1967.
- Reinsch, N. L., Jr. A test of hypotheses derived from Osborn, Piaget and Osgood concerning the metaphor. Paper presented at the 58th annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, December 1972.
- Reinsch, N. L., Jr. Figurative language and source credibility: A preliminary investigation and reconceptualization. Human Communication Research, 1974, 1, 75-80.

Appendix A

Credibility Induction Materials

Last Spring the students in a creative writing class here at Western were asked to write a metaphoric statement which would express their conception of Western Illinois University and would also reveal something about themselves.

On the following pages you will get to read some of the statements which they wrote. In each case reported here the student reported that he or she was very satisfied with the statement written, that is he or she felt that the statement did a good job of expressing his or her concept of W.I.U. and that the statement did accurately reveal something about the author.

In order to see if the authors were right we want you to give us your first impression of the students and try to predict how they would answer certain questions.

Susan is a junior. She is a psychology major, sociology minor. She is a member of a student voluntary service organization. Her statement was:

Thomas is a junior. He is a general business major. He is a member of a fraternity. His statement was:

Appendix B
Experimental Scales

Activity

passive--active
slow--fast

Evaluation

negative--positive
bad--good

Potency

weak--strong
soft--hard

Homophily

different from me--similiar to me
unlike me--like me
doesn't think like me--thinks like me
doesn't share my attitudes--shares my attitudes

Sociability

irritable--good-natured
negativistic--cooperative
gloomy--cheerful

Composure

anxious--calm
tense--relaxed
nervous--poised

Competence

inexpert--expert
unqualified--qualified
unintelligent--intelligent

Extraversion

withdrawn--outgoing
quiet--verbal
timid--bold

Character

selfish--unselfish
dishonest--honest
bad--good